



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,141	02/06/2006	Ying-Duo Gao	21348P	2925
210 7590 07/16/2009 MERCK AND CO., INC P O BOX 2000 RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907			EXAMINER STOCKTON, LAURA LYNNE	
			ART UNIT 1626	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/16/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/567,141

Applicant(s)

GAO ET AL.

Examiner

Laura L. Stockton

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 12-14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date July 2, 2009
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 9, 12-14 and 16-21 are pending in the application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on November 5, 2008 was acknowledged in the previous Office Action. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). The requirement was deemed proper and therefore made FINAL in the previous Office Action.

Claims 16-21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no

allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on November 5, 2008.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has considered the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 2, 2009.

Rejections made in the previous Office Action that do not appear below have been overcome by Applicant's amendments to the claims. Therefore, arguments pertaining to these rejections will not be addressed.

Oath/Declaration

Upon reconsideration, Applicant is not required to submit a substitute declaration or oath as stated in the previous Office Action.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 14, Compound 18, the R¹ substituent should be "CH(CH₃)₂". See original claim 14 on page 40. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written

description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a new matter rejection. No support in the specification or the original filed claims can be found for the variable R^5 representing an unlimited number of carbons in the "bicycloalkyl" substituent. However, there is support for the R^5 variable representing " C_5-C_{11} bicycloalkyl". See the instant specification on page 3 (line 11) and original filed claim 1. Applicant did not state where in the specification {page number(s) and line number(s)} support could be found for the amendments to the claims. Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments. See M.P.E.P. §§ 714.02 and 2163.06. Therefore, the claims lack written description as such.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makriyannis et al. {WO 01/29007}.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Applicant claims pyrazole compounds. **Makriyannis et al.** (see entire document; particularly pages 3-5 and especially the compounds in Table 1 on page 8) teach pyrazole compounds that are structurally similar to the instant claimed compounds.

***Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims
(MPEP §2141.02)***

The difference between the compounds of the prior art and the compounds instantly claimed is that the instant claimed compounds are generically described in the prior art.

***Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (MPEP
§2142-2413)***

The indiscriminate selection of "some" among "many" is *prima facie* obvious, In re Lemin, 141 USPQ 814 (C.C.P.A. 1964). The motivation to make the claimed compounds derives from the expectation that structurally similar compounds would possess similar activity (e.g., treating depression).

One skilled in the art would thus be motivated to prepare products embraced by the prior art to arrive at the instant claimed products with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial products which would be useful in treating, for example, depression. The

instant claimed invention would have been suggested to one skilled in the art and therefore, the instant claimed invention would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is allowed over the art of record.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of

this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

This application contains claims 16-21 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in the reply filed on November 5, 2008. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura L. Stockton whose telephone number is (571) 272-0710. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 am to 2:30 pm. If the examiner is out of the Office, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane, can be reached on (571) 272-0699.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

The Official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

/Laura L. Stockton/
Laura L. Stockton
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626
Work Group 1620
Technology Center 1600

July 15, 2009